

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,915	05/25/2001	Thomas Daniel	208608US0PCT	2083
22850 7590 01/16/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.		EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA VA 22314	R, DANIEL S			
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	01/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			4		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summers	09/831,915	DANIEL ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
71 114111110 0 1 7 7 1 1 1	Daniel S. Metzmaier	1712			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 86(a). In no event, however, may a rep rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ABA	ATION. by be timely filed fS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 De	ecember 2006.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) <u>1-7,10-14,16-18,20 and 21</u> is/are pend	ding in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,10-14,16-18,20 and 21</u> is/are rejec	oted.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:		19(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents					
 Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau 		ceived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ceived.			
•	•				
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		nmary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Mail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

Application/Control Number: 09/831,915

Art Unit: 1712

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-7, 10-14, 16-18, and 20-21 are pending.

Response to Amendment

- 1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
- The indicated allowability of claim 22 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to The Procter & Gamble Company, WO 97/46195. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1712

5. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-14, 16, 18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over The Procter & Gamble Company, WO 97/46195, (hereafter Procter & Gamble), in view of Trinh et al, US 5,429,628 (example 9, column 25, lines 35-40) and **Modern Superabsorbent Polymer Technology**, edited by Fredric L. Buchholz and Andrew T. Graham, Wiley-VCH, pp. 97-101 (November 1997). Procter & Gamble (page 6, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs; examples and claims) discloses the combination of silica, AGM, and zeolite as an odour control system in an absorbent article.

Trinh et al (example 9, column 25, lines 35-40) discloses AGM is commercial polyacrylate particles (Drytech 512 from Dow Chemical). AGM reads on said dried hydrogel.

Procter & Gamble (page 5, 2nd paragraph) discloses the odour control system may comprise sodium silicate as an essential component. Procter & Gamble (page 6, 4th paragraph) discloses the odour control system may be made employing spray drying, spray mixing, or agglomeration processes. Procter & Gamble further discloses the silicate itself may act as a binder for the odour control system. Procter & Gamble (page 6, 3rd paragraph) discloses the odour control system may be in the form of particulates, granulates, flakes, noodles, and exudates.

Modern Superabsorbent Polymer Technology (pp. 97 et seq) disclose the advantageous step of surface cross-linking to avoid gel blocking of soluble polyacrylic acids.

These references are combinable since they teach polyacrlate polymers for absorbent articles and odour control systems therefore useful for personal use articles,

e.g., sanitary napkins and diapers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of applicants' invention to post cross-link the odour control systems taught in the Procter & Gamble reference, which employ polyacrylates for the advantage of avoiding gel blocking.

Trinh et al further (column 16, lines 47 et seq; and example 9) discloses forming odour control granules for absorbent articles comprising AGM and zeolite in particulate form by adding water, blending and drying. Trinh et al (column 16, lines 47 et seq) teaches gel formation and further teach silica materials.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of applicants' invention to employ the the methods of intimately mixing the alkali silicate and polyacrylates as conventional in the art as shown by the Trinh et al reference.

To the extent Procter & Gamble differs from the claims in the value of n is not disclosed in the reference, applicants acknowledge the alkali silicates are commercially available. Applicants have not shown any criticality for the claimed ratio of alkali metal oxides to silica, which are commonly available sodium silicate.

6. Claims 4-5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The Procter & Gamble Company, WO 97/46195, (hereafter Procter & Gamble), as evidenced by or in view of Trinh et al, US 5,429,628 (example 9, column 25, lines 35-40). Procter & Gamble (page 6, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs; examples and claims) discloses the combination of silica, AGM, and zeolite as an odour control system in an absorbent article.

Trinh et al (example 9, column 25, lines 35-40) discloses AGM is commercial polyacrylate particles (Drytech 512 from Dow Chemical). AGM reads on said dried hydrogel.

Procter & Gamble differs from claims 4 and 5 in the point of addition of the sodium silicate and the further combination of a neutralizing agent, i.e., alkali metal hydroxide or alkali metal carbonate.

Procter & Gamble (examples) discloses the use of neutralized polyacrylates. Changes in the order of process steps has been held to be prima facie obvious. See MPEP 2144.04(C). Furthermore, the use of conventional neutralizing agents, i.e., sodium carbonate, is within the level of one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention for the advantage of adjusting the pH of the system for the advantage of making it hypoallergenic as would be required in The Procter & Gamble reference.

Procter & Gamble differs from claim 17 in the use of sodium silicate rather than potassium silicate claimed but discloses metal silicates and specifically mentions sodium silicate.

These references are combinable since they teach absorbent materials for personal use articles, e.g., sanitary napkins and diapers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of applicants' invention to employ potassium silicate as an obvious functional equivalent to the sodium silicate and their structural similarity.

Art Unit: 1712

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 10-14, 16-18, and 20-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S. Metzmaier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1089. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy P. Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daniel S. Metzmaier $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1712

DSM